



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The argument that wars save the world from over-population is really too ridiculous to spend much time on. Nature takes care of the question of over-population, and man need not kill his brother for fear that there will not be room for both.

ARMAMENTS.

To the practical man it is beginning to become very clear that international peace is an absolute and immediate necessity. The rapidly-increasing cost and destructiveness of war is compelling peace. Seven-tenths of our federal receipts already go to the payment of the expenses of our past wars and the preparation for future wars. The same conditions exist in other nations. At the present cost of warships and other new war equipments, it seems that all the world is rushing madly toward bankruptcy,—and for what purpose? The relative strength of the nations remains about the same in spite of the vast and growing burdens of militarism. Whether one nation has five warships to the others' five, or twenty-five warships to the others' twenty-five, nothing is gained and much is lost by the increase.

It is often claimed that preparation for war, large armies and navies and strong fortifications tend to prevent war. Although this may be so at times, the contrary is more often the case. Place armed men close together, on both sides of a frontier, and there is more likely to be a test of strength between the two countries than if the frontier were free from soldiers.

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

Between the United States and Canada there are more than three thousand miles of unfortified and undefended boundary, and for one hundred years we have lived in perfect peace with our near neighbor to the north. The treaty of reciprocity which we are about to make will bring us even closer together. It is suggested that in 1914 a free bridge be built at Niagara Falls connecting Canada with the United States in commemoration of this hundred years of peace between the two great nations.

Is there any reason why all the world should not be as neighborly as Canada is with the United States?

JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES.

Suspicion brings danger. We should have faith, which brings faith in return. Life is like a mirror, which reflects what appears before it. Present an offer of fraternity and fraternity is reflected. If the alarmists keep on shouting war with Japan long enough and loudly enough they may, at a psychological moment, bring on war by spreading alarm and inciting passion. Japan has no more desire for war with us than we have with her. If we are but friendly and just to her, there is no reason why we should not enjoy enduring peace. To the alarmist we say, Stop! Have more faith in your brothers!

"SEEING IS BELIEVING."

The so-called practical man says, "Seeing is believing." Very often, on the contrary, believing is seeing. Those who are optimistic help to bring on the very condition they hope for, and those who are pessimistic cause gloom about them, which hinders the development of the best tendencies.

Can we not already see that the history of the individual is now being worked out most logically in the history of the nations? The organization of The Hague

is going on slowly but surely. All the nations have agreed on the principle of international arbitration. Since the first Hague Conference in 1899, one hundred and thirteen limited treaties of obligatory arbitration have been signed. An Interparliamentary Union has been established, its membership being made up of present and former members of the legislative bodies of the world. This Interparliamentary Union has met sixteen times in the last twenty-one years, and is a powerful and practical body working steadily toward universal peace.

Switzerland, Belgium, the Suez Canal and other territories have been neutralized. The more territory neutralized, the less chance of war. The International Peace Bureau at Berne, the International Bureau of American Republics, the Central American High Court are all parts of the new machinery for international peace.

WHAT YOU CAN DO.

You ask what you can do to help this good cause now? First, study the progress of the last hundred years, and have faith in the conclusion that international peace is a practical proposition and must be established through an international court and an international code of law between the nations. Speak of these things hopefully everywhere; join organized movements for peace. The individual can express himself with most force through organizations.

Remember that wars settle nothing. Wars decide but the relative strength of the combatants. They do not decide which side is right. The only lasting settlement of any conflict is one that is based on justice. The question which side is right can be decided not by war, but only by an impartial and competent court.

Let us not go through life like the man with the hoe, looking downward, but, spurning the dross of life and suppressing our savage instinct, look upward and onward, encouraged by the ever-present star of hope and sustained by abiding faith in our fellowman. Then shall we help to save the world from international brutality, from international injustice.

New York City.

Canada and World Peace.

BY W. L. SMITH, EDITOR OF THE TORONTO "WEEKLY SUN."

An address delivered before the Young People's Association of the Alhambra Avenue Presbyterian Church, Toronto.

All Canadians profess a desire to see peace maintained. As to some of the methods proposed with a view of attaining this end, there is room for question. Some there are who would have Canada create a naval armament for the purpose of assisting Great Britain to keep on the high seas a navy equal to that of any two other powers combined. They would also have us create an army available at all times for service in possible imperial wars. They say with this done the empire would be in a position to enforce peace by the threatened use of the mailed fist.

Any attempt to establish peace in this way must prove futile, and for two reasons:

In the first place, all history, from the time of the Roman Empire to Napoleon I, proves that peace cannot be permanently maintained through the preponderance of any one power. If the end we all desire is to be

brought about, it must be by general agreement among the nations; not by any one nation, or any two nations, assuming the role of big policemen towards the rest. It is not in human nature, either in individuals or in nations, to assent to arbitrary rule even for so beneficent a purpose as the preservation of peace. International peace, to be permanent, must have as its basis international co-operation.

In the second place, the Canada of to-day, and still more the Canada of to-morrow, cannot, in my judgment, be tied up to any such scheme of imperialism as the one proposed. The present character of our population and the changes in this respect that are taking place present insuperable obstacles in the way. Fifty years ago in Ontario the word "home" meant England, Ireland or Scotland, because most of the people then here had come from Great Britain. To-day in this the most British of the nine provinces now forming the Dominion, the majority of those of active age represent the third generation at least on Canadian soil. Moreover, while the great majority of us are still of British ancestry, there is a large and growing minority made up of people from continental Europe, as witness St. John's ward in this city. In the western provinces it is probable that at least a third of the population is from the United States, and that not less than one-tenth is from continental Europe. The admixture of alien elements is going to proportionately increase; and, as years pass, even the native-born of British ancestry in Ontario and the West will find their interests more and more centred in the land of their adoption, with a consequent lessening of concern in the land of their fathers. All this being so, even if there were no Quebec to be considered, Canada is bound to be drawn away from the things which concern imperial statesmen in India, in the Persian Gulf and in Egypt.

This does not mean that this country will lose interest in the preservation of world peace and in the blessings that may be thereby secured for Great Britain in common with all humanity. But the Dominion will work along different lines than those marked out for her by those who would rest peace on force. The appeal of the Canadian people will be to reason and justice rather than to the god of battles. And circumstances are such as to enable us to play a leading part in this other and better way. We are not cursed with a heritage of hates arising from past wars. There is not, on the northern half of this continent, any of the race hatreds such as exist between France and Germany. Not only are we free from the germs left by past wars,—the most prolific source from which wars are bred,—but we are absolutely invulnerable against attack save from one source. The alleged danger of invasion by Germany on the one side or Japan on the other is based on nothing more substantial than disordered imagination or a nightmare following on indigestion. Ten years ago it taxed the resources of Great Britain, backed by the colonies, to subdue two South African States with a combined population less than that of Toronto; and this although the ports leading to the hostile territory were already in the hands of the British. How, then, could Germany or Japan, with no landing place already in possession, with only one-sixth the tonnage available for transporting troops that Britain possessed at the time of the South African War, expect to conquer seven million Canadians?

The only country in a position to make serious war in Canada is the United States, and against the United States we possess a better defense than could be secured by a line of fortifications along the border and fleets of Dreadnoughts on two oceans. This defense is found in a common language, common ideals, in the union of our church and fraternal societies, in family ties, in the presence of a million and a half Canadians in the United States and three-quarters of a million Americans in Canada.

Canada, then, free from all danger of attack, is, acting in concert with the United States, in a position to give a powerful impetus to the movement making for world peace. These two countries have indeed already set a splendid example for the nations of the Old World in this particular. Ever since 1818 the great lakes uniting these kindred peoples have been free from the presence of war ships. The frowning fortresses once found here and there along the boundary dividing them are falling into decay. Recently the Dominion and Republic have gone further; in what is known as the Water Ways Treaty, but which deserves a more comprehensive title, they have provided in advance the machinery for settling, by a joint tribunal, with reference to The Hague if necessary, any question that may hereafter arise between them. They actually have settled through The Hague a question relating to sea coast fisheries which had been a constant source of irritation for one hundred years, and settled it in a way that has met the cordial approval of educated public opinion on both sides of the line.

One thing more these kindred nations should do. The centennial anniversary of the end of the one war that has taken place between them will soon occur. On both sides of the line ill-advised people are urging the adoption of a course that may, in a measure, fan into fresh life the dying embers of past fires. On the American side it is proposed by some to celebrate Perry's victory over the British fleet on Lake Erie. On the Canadian side there are proposals to celebrate the Canadian victories of Queenston Heights and Lundy's Lane. Would it not be more in keeping with the civilization of this twentieth century of the Christian era to hold an international thanksgiving for a hundred years of peace, and to connect with this a solemn covenant that the peace so long maintained shall never again be broken?

The Latin States of South America, which we have been wont to look upon as inferior to us in civilization, have really outstripped us in the better way. Near the close of the last century Chile and Argentine were brought to the verge of war over a boundary dispute. In both countries there was arming in feverish haste on sea and land; in both a conflict was believed to be inevitable. Then better counsels prevailed. The British Ministers at the two capitals appealed for peace. The appeal was vigorously supported by two Catholic bishops, one in Chile and the other in Argentine. A special appeal was made on Easter Sunday to the conscience and Christian spirit of both peoples. The appeal was heard. The question in dispute was left to the decision of King Edward, and his decision was accepted by both nations. Then armies were disbanded, battleships were sold, an arsenal was turned into an industrial school. And something else was done. Cannon created for war were cast into the melting pot, and from this pot came forth a

giant figure of the Christ, and this statue was erected at the highest point in the Andes at the very centre of what had been the disputed territory. On this statue were carved the words:

"Sooner shall these mountains crumble into dust than Argentines and Chileans break the peace to which they have pledged themselves at the feet of Christ the Redeemer."

The noblest monument, with the grandest inscription, erected in the history of the race. Would it not be well if, instead of erecting memorials on battlefields, we were, at the coming centennial of peace, to erect a monument between Canada and the United States such as that now standing between Chile and Argentine? An action such as that, attracting, as it would, world-wide attention, could hardly fail to give an impetus to world-wide peace.

Some of the other Latin American States have set an example of another kind,—one which does not appeal to sentiment or conscience to the same extent as the one just noted, but one that is perhaps more practical. Some four or five of the petty states of Central America, each independent of the other, have established a joint international court for the adjudication of questions arising between them. This international court, as I understand it, stands somewhat in the same position towards these independant states as the Supreme Court of the United States stands in towards the federated states of the adjoining republic, the main difference being that this Central American Court depends solely on moral force for the acceptance of its decrees.

It has been said that no matter what you do you cannot abolish war,—that human nature will lead men to fight. If that be true of nations, it must also be true of individuals. But we have changed human nature as regards individuals. When my grandfather was in his prime the duel was the common method of settling personal quarrels in England. My father was well on to middle life before the practice had wholly ceased. I remember, as a lad, hearing my uncle, a good Christian, express approval of the duel. To-day if one of you proposed pistols for two and coffee for one the police would arrest you either as a criminal or a lunatic. What we have done as individuals we are beginning to do as states. Central American States, as I have just said, have created an international court for the settlement of differences between their governments just as civil courts in Canada decide questions of property and civil rights between individuals. As between Canada and the United States we have, too, under the Water Ways Treaty, at least gone so far as to provide a court to which questions arising between Canada and the United States may be referred and the decision of which shall be binding. As between other nations the principle of international arbitration, as distinguished from the principle involved in the creation of international courts, has been widely accepted. Since 1814 well on to three hundred disputes between nations—disputes such as in the time of our grandfather would have led to war—have been settled in that way. To seventy of these arbitrations Great Britain was a party, and to sixty the United States was a party. That these were no mere minor cases is shown by the fact that three arbitration cases between Great Britain and the United States involved \$22,000,000 in the aggregate. A greater achievement

was the peaceful adjustment of the Dogger Bank affair, because the firing on a British vessel by Russian warships and the destruction of British lives involved a question of national honor, and that at a time when public feeling in Great Britain had been greatly inflamed. Most of the nations have, I believe, accepted the principle of arbitration, in a measure at least, but in all these acceptances there have been reservations. Questions of "national honor," or of "vital interest," have been excepted.

It has been left to President Taft—all honor to him for the doing of it—to go further and declare for the settlement of all international questions by reason and justice rather than by force. President Taft has gone further than to propose arbitration. He has proposed that a permanent international court be created, to which all international questions must of necessity be referred, and which court shall decide all questions in accordance with equity and justice. I believe this action by President Taft will be more than sufficient to place his name beside that of Lincoln in the page of history. Lincoln struck the shackles from four million physical slaves. The action of Taft promises to free the minds of all humanity from the mental slavery and superstition which is the heritage of ages of conflict.

The United States has already, not by design but by accident, by force of circumstances, given to the world the most wonderful concrete example in the possibilities of world peace the world has ever seen. Within the memory of men still living the republic has taken in over twenty million immigrants from all the civilized countries of the world. It has taken in Germans and Frenchmen, Austrians and Russians, Norwegians and Poles. It has proved that these peoples, who had been at one another's throats through countless centuries, can live in peace side by side, and has thus demonstrated the possibility of others of these same races living in peace side by side in the Old World.

What the United States has done in the past century Canada will do in the present. We are now attracting immigration not only from the Old World but from the United States as well. We are going to present the greatest admixture of races since the beginning of time, and in doing this we shall repeat and emphasize the lesson of the possibilities of world peace already set by the United States. Because of this admixture of race in Canada we cannot transform the Dominion into part of an imperial war power, but we can make of this country something vastly better—a leader in the movement making for world peace. The first step should be in the form of acceptance of the Taft proposal and the creation of a court with power to adjudicate upon all questions arising between these two countries, and to which all questions must of necessity be referred. The second should be in the form of preparations for an international celebration in 1915 that will magnify peace, not glorify war; and the third should take the form of proposing a joint agreement under which even naval training ships shall be excluded from the Great Lakes. Action such as this would be a good thing for America; it would be a great thing for the world. The example set by two nations, side by side, each maintaining a separate existence, and without a fort or warship dividing them, could not fail to have a powerful effect on the Old World

Even if the moral effect of the example failed, economic forces would compel the adoption of a like course in Europe, because nations burdened by the present scale of armaments could not long hope to maintain their place in the race with nations free of such load. Along this line Canada may do much to hasten the time when battle flags shall be forever furled and war drums shall no longer alarm. In promoting such action on the part of the Dominion each citizen may perform, in its highest and best sense, a really patriotic service.

Laying the Foundation Deep.

BY BRADLEY GILMAN.

The signs of the times point clearly to the steady and rapid approach of a general system of international arbitration. Not only has the past decade shown a larger number of disputes peacefully and equitably settled than during the previous half century, but the past year — yes, even the recent half year — is replete with indications that world-opinion is swinging powerfully toward peaceful solutions of all international questions. The very word "peace" is seen in the pages of the daily press and in the monthly magazines far more frequently than formerly. The editorials of our leading journals lend their influence toward the peaceful solution of international disputes rather than to wanton bloodshed and economic waste. Even the humorous papers, and the humorous paragraphs of the serious journals, frequently assume, as the crux of their wit and humor, that war is discredited and an anachronism.

To one who looks for these unconscious testimonials to the advance of the peace movement, the gratifying conclusion is very evident: the peace idea is taking root in the minds and hearts of men of all nations. Not only do men like Edwin Ginn and Andrew Carnegie nobly evince their belief in the soundness of "the idea," and President Taft and Edward Grey show their acceptance of it, but the people at large, the "men on the street," are also awaking as from a dream, and asking themselves and their fellows, "Why this waste of blood and treasure? Need it be?"

Thus among high officials, and among the "plain people" who give to them their official power, "the peace idea" is taking root; but we must remember that, although presidents and cabinet ministers and senates may seem to be achieving much in their formal overtures one to another, and apart from the people, yet it is really by the will of the people that an enduring condition of world-peace is to be maintained; the great masses of the people must become imbued with the desire for arbitration, else when strained conditions between two or more countries arise the compacts and treaties of high officials — individuals or august assemblies — will be snapped like tow threads, and the clamor will be inevitably for war. This was what led us into the Spanish War. President McKinley was for peace, and other wise and humane advisers stood with him; but the populace — and unscrupulous journals who voiced the feverish popular demands — forced the hands of our leaders and brought us into war.

Hence it must be remembered that, although we rejoice in the friendly stretching out of high official hands across the seas, we must prosecute an earnest campaign of edu-

cation among the plain people. Almost any treaty or *entente* will hold when there is no irritation or seeming injustice in international relations; but during this period of calm we must establish deeply in the minds and hearts of the plain people of all civilized nations a belief in arbitration; then when friction arises, and heated rantings of demagogues and yellow journals tend toward war, the peace idea will still hold the people at large; and they will be loyal, in stress and storm, to the high ideal which they have welcomed and affirmed in the days of their calm, deliberate judgment.

A World Court.

BY CHARLES RICHARDSON.

The failure of the second Hague Conference to unite upon a method for selecting judges for a World Court, and the apparently insurmountable difficulties which caused that failure, have resulted very naturally in a tendency to favor the creation of a court by a small group of the larger powers without the assent or participation of the other and much more numerous nations. While this would undoubtedly be a long step in advance of present conditions, the court agreed upon at The Hague would be so much more useful and influential that the hope of securing it should not be abandoned without further efforts.

The influence and success of an international court must necessarily depend upon the extent to which it can obtain the support of that intangible, but almost omnipotent, force known as public opinion, or the opinions of mankind, and it is obvious that a court controlled by a small group of nations could not obtain that support to anything like the same degree as one in which all, or nearly all, the nations were satisfactorily represented.

In the countries excluded from any share in the formation of such a court there would probably be something analogous to the anti-class feeling with which the majority of Americans would regard a court in which all the judges were selected by Wall Street bankers or corporation lawyers.

A large proportion of international differences are between strong nations and weak ones, and in such cases there would be no court with jurisdiction over both parties, and neither the parties themselves, nor the people of other countries, could have confidence in the impartiality of a court controlled entirely by a few of the most powerful nations.

The creation of such a court would probably lead to the formation of a similar court or courts by some other group or groups of nations, and then there would be conflicting decisions with no provision for their appeal or correction. But whether there should be one court or several, so long as there should be no supreme tribunal which could be regarded as representing all the nations, the lack of it would continue to be urged as a conclusive argument for great armies and navies.

With these considerations in mind, it seems to be an imperative duty to reexamine the difficulty which the Hague Conference failed to overcome in its project for a world court. Stated briefly, that difficulty consisted in the conflicting claims of the small and large states. The former were determined that each state should appoint one judge, while the latter insisted that no such arrangement could ever be accepted.